<u>Remarks & Arguments</u>

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1-30 are pending in the application, and that Claims 1-30 are rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. The amendments herein do not add new matter to the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 11 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Boothby et al. (US Patent No. 6, 044,381) in view of Novak et al. (US Patent No. 6,643,669). The rejection alleges that Boothby teaches:

a)   designating a first database as a source database and a second database as a target database;

b)   determining a state of a first modification flag of a first data record in said source database, wherein said first modification flag indicates that said first data record in said source database has been modified;

c)   provided that said first modification flag is set, propagating said first data record in said source database to said first data record in said target database;

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the flag of Boothby is not the same as the flag as defined in the specification of the present invention. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to include the limitations that the first modification flag is contained in the first data record. The flag of

Boothby is not contained in the corresponding record. Instead the flag is contained in the information sent from the remote segment to the host computer, col. 4, lines 59-3. Claims 1, 21 and 12 have also been amended to include the limitation that the value of the first modification flag, indicative of a particular event, is set upon the occurrence of the particular event. The flag of Boothby is not set when a modification of the corresponding record occurs. Instead, Boothby teaches that the flag is set upon a comparison of the records from the remote database and the host database against a history file, col. 7, lines 4-11. Thus, Boothby does not teach or suggest the limitation of "determining a state of a first modification flag <u>contained in</u> a first data record in said source database, wherein said first modification flag indicates that said first data record in said source database has been modified <u>and wherein a value of said first modification flag, indicative of a particular event, is set upon an occurrence of said particular event</u>."

The rejection further alleges that Novak teaches:

d) provided that said first modification flag is not set, comparing a first modification count contained in said first data record in said source database with a second modification count contained in said first data record in said target database, said first and second modification counts each being a value indicating how many times said first data record in said source database and said first data record in said target database has been modified respectively; and

e) provided that said first modification count has a higher value than said second modification count, propagating said first data record in said source database to said first data record in said target database, wherein said steps a)

through e) can be completed without comparing raw data of said first data record

and said corresponding data record.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the modification count of Novak is not the same as the

flag as claimed in Claims 1, 11 and 21. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to include the

limitations that the first modification count is contained in the first data record as claimed. The

modification count of Novak is not contained in the corresponding record. Instead the

modification count is contained in the synchronization message, col. 5, lines 39-50. In addition,

the first modification counts is a value indicating how many times the first data record in the

source database has been modified. Novak on the other hand teaches that the modification count

is a value indicating how may changes have been made to the database, col. 5, lines 44-45.

Furthermore, Novak also does not teach the second modification count of Claims 1, 11 and 33.

Even if Boothby and Novak provide the alleged teachings, Applicant respectfully asserts

that there is no teaching or suggestion to combine the particular elements of Boothby and Novak

as relied upon in the rejection. The rejection has not shown a suggestion to eliminate the

essential element of a history file in Boothby, col. 6, lines 22-29. Boothby specifically teaches

that if there is no history file, all the records from both databases will be loaded into the

workspace so that a "complete comparison of the raw data of both databases can be performed."

Hence, Boothby actually teaches away from the claimed combination of Claims 1, 11 and 21.

The rejection also has not shown a suggestion to eliminate the MAPITEM record of Novak, col.,

3, line 56 through col. 5, line 50. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Boothby

and/or Novak to combine the use of a modification flag with a modification count.

Page 15 of 17

For all of the above-stated reasons Claims 1, 11 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Boothby and Novak. Boothby does not teach or suggest that a first modification flag is <u>contained in</u> a first data record in said source database or that <u>a value of said first modification flag, indicative of a particular event, is set upon an occurrence of said particular event</u> as claimed. Novak does not teach or suggest that the first modification count is contained in the first data record or that the first modification counts is a value indicating how <u>many times</u> the first <u>data record</u> in the source database has been modified. Furthermore, Boothby and/or Novak do not provide a motivation to combine the use of a modification flag and a modification count associated with each record to synchronize a source and target database as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 2-7, 12-17 and 22-27, depend from patentable independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, respectively, and incorporate all the limitation thereof. Thus, Claims 2-7, 12-17 and 22-27, are also patentable for the above-advanced reasons with respect to independent Claims 1, 11 and 21. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-0085. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: March 17, 2004

Eric J. Gash
Registration No. 46,274
Tel.: (408) 938-9060

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060